

**REMARKS**

The Final Office Action of January 9, 2008 was received and carefully reviewed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejections are requested for the reasons advanced in detail below. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication that claim 12 contains allowable subject matter.

By the present amendment, claims 1 and 7 have amended to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-10, and 12 remain pending in the instant application. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments present above, as well as the remarks presented below, to place the application in condition for immediate allowance or to simplify matters for appeal.

On page 2 of the Final Office Action, claims 1 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 7 in accordance with the Examiner's comments, and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

On pages 3 to 4 of the Final Office Action, claims 1 and 3-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Beck et al. (WO 01/17834). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a vehicle air supply system including, in part, a control means that includes "a timer which is operable *to selectively cause and inhibit* the intermediate regeneration depending upon air supply requirements," (emphasis added). In direct contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, Beck et al. fails to teach or suggest that the governor 20 is "operable to selectively cause and inhibit the intermediate regeneration depending upon air supply requirements," as required by at least amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Beck et al. fails to teach or suggest the combination of features recited by independent claim 1, as amended, and hence dependent claims 3-10 and 12. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1 and 3-10 under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) in view of Beck et al. be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully assert that the present Amendment places the above-referenced application in immediate condition for allowance. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the prior art rejection of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that all pending claims be indicated as allowable, and that the application be passed to issue.

If a conference would expedite prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

/David B. Hardy, Reg. No. 47, 362/

David B. Hardy

Registration No. 47,362

Date: June 16, 2008

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
401 9<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Suite 900  
Washington., D.C. 20004  
(202) 585-8000